

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action of May 21, 2003.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being rejected by U.S. Patent No. 5,791,247 to Kolb. Claim 9 states that the controller operates “said valves independently of one another such that the flow of gas through the valves is varied in response to information about said printing.” Kolb discloses a controller 91 which controls valves 122 and 123. However, the reference does not teach or suggest that the flow of fluid through valves 122 and 123 is varied in response to information about printing. The reference merely states that the valves can be adjusted. According to MPEP 2131, “to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim,” and therefore Kolb does not anticipate all the elements of claim 9.

Claims 1-5, 7 and 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,791,247 to Kolb in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,428,159 to Roy et al. Claim 1 has been amended to recited “a controller for controlling the flow rate of gas through said valves based on the amount of ink deposited during printing.” Kolb in view of Roy et al. does not disclose controlling the flow of gas through said valves based on the amount of ink deposited during printing. Kolb states that “the present invention . . . keep[s] the ink droplets on top of the paper and then actively dr[ies] the ink droplets by applying heat during the printing process.” Col. 5, lines 32-36.

Roy et al. teaches adjusting the amount of energy that is supplied to a dryer based on the amount of ink that is deposited by a printhead. Roy et al. states: “the amount of energy supplied to the dryer is adjusted according to the amount of ink just deposited by one of printheads 40-46, by computing image data for that printhead.” Col. 6, lines 39-42. Energy is not equal to flow rate.

Since neither Roy et al. nor Kolb teach or suggest controlling the flow rate of gas through said valves based on the amount of ink deposited during printing, there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely,



Deborah Blyveis
Birdwell, Janke & Durando, PLC
Reg. No. 47,337

X:\data\wp51\AUKERMAN\004\Amend002.wpd



VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

In the claims:

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended as follows:

1. (Twice Amended) An ink drying system for high speed printing on a traveling sheet of material, the system being coupled to a source of pressurized gas and comprising:

a plurality of plenums disposed so as to extend over the sheet, said plenums each including an associated plurality of orifices spaced apart from one another so as to define respective drying portions thereof;

a corresponding plurality of fluid flow valves for controlling fluid communication between said plenums and the source of pressurized gas; and

a controller for controlling the flow rate of gas through said valves based on the amount of ink deposited during printing.

9. (Amended) An ink printing and drying system for high speed printing including a print head for depositing ink on a traveling sheet of material, the system being coupled to a source of pressurized gas and comprising:

a plurality of plenums associated with the print head, said plenums disposed so as to extend over the sheet and each of said plenums including an associated plurality of orifices spaced apart from one another so as to define respective drying portions thereof;

a corresponding plurality of fluid flow valves for controlling fluid communication between said plenums and the source of pressurized gas, one of said

plurality of fluid flow valves corresponding to one of said plurality of plenums; and

a controller for controlling said valves, said controller being adapted to operate said valves independently of one another such that the flow of gas through the valves is varied in response to information about said printing.